



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

already covered with geodetic determinations, accurately and uniformly made. The distinguished astronomer Bessel has been some time employed in combining all these results, and deducing from them an accurate determination of the elements of the terrestrial spheroid : and has, in the course of the present year, communicated to his correspondent in this country the proximate results of the investigation.

Such being the state of Geodæsia in the old world, and such being its uses and effects upon science and the arts, it cannot be supposed that any consideration of false economy will again influence an administration in this country to look upon it otherwise than with favor. It is not by its immediate use, that we can most justly appreciate it, but by those more remote, though not less certain advantages, which have by similar means been produced elsewhere. It is to serve the country, by practising the young officers of the army and navy in operations requiring an intimate knowledge of the higher branches of the exact sciences ; by contributing to the formation of a school of native artists, who may presently be able to furnish the requisite instruments of our own manufacture ; and by bringing together into competition and acquaintance, the artists and scientific men of the country, thus forming a school of the highest and most useful talent in it. By such considerations it should be estimated both by the people and the government ; for by such results it will be doubtless attended, should the patronage of the government be continued to it on a scale commensurate with the importance and dignity of the object.

---

ART. IV. — *Moore's Lectures on the Greek Language and Literature.*

*Lectures on the Greek Language and Literature.* By N. F. MOORE, LL. D. Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages in Columbia College. 12mo. New York. 1835.

PROFESSOR MOORE has long been known as an able and zealous teacher of the classics. From the academical lecture-room the reputation of his learning has noiselessly gone abroad, and he is now justly placed among the most distinguished American scholars. In 1834, he published an unpretending volume on the mineralogy of the Ancients, which is a model

of thorough research, clear arrangement, and elegant style. The student of antiquity will find in it all that has been said on the subject of which it treats.

Mr. Moore's next effort in the line of authorship was the volume of lectures, the title of which is placed at the head of this article. The subjects handled in these lectures may naturally be expected to excite a livelier curiosity in most readers, than the learned investigations in the work above alluded to. The principles which lie at the foundation of European literature, and the works in which those principles were first embodied, must be attractive topics of study and discussion, so long as the present civilization of Europe exists. The attempts of radical reformers in education to overthrow the system of classical learning, will have no important influence on the general estimation in which the classics are held. Do what they will, the first venerable teachers of wisdom and masters of song stand at the cradle of the intellectual culture of Europe. Do what they will, the ever busy mind of man will be curious to trace the course of human thought up to its fountain head; and if he finds there pure and sparkling waters, fresh from the living springs of Nature, he will slake the thirst of his spirit, in spite of the utilitarian enticements of the radical reformer, charm he never so wisely.

Mr. Moore's book contains six lectures, a part, as he tells us in his preface, of a short course delivered in Columbia college. In all of them he shews an intimate knowledge of his subject. His method is clear, his style simple and polished, rising sometimes into beauty and elegance. Occasionally it is rather stiff, and betrays a want of the easy flow of a practised writer. But it has the merit of being free from all the barbarisms and exaggerations, the new-fangled phraseology and hot-bed intensity, by which the writings of this age are disagreeably distinguished from those of every other. The book indicates a love of ancient learning, not springing from mere sentiment, not spoiled by affectation, a thing not wholly unknown in these times, but grown up from, and flourished by profound meditation, and interwoven with all the intellectual habits of the author. It is a love of genuine classical learning of the old sort, won by hard study, in the spirit of the precept so well expressed by the Roman poet,

“ Vos exemplaria Græca

—— Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ.”

But these lectures are too rapid and comprehensive to allow the introduction of much new matter, or any very deep criticism. Their merit consists in clearly grouping together the most striking facts, in the history of Greek literature, in the history and powers of the Greek language, and the character of that language in its present condition. We could have wished the Professor had gone more deeply into the spirit and tendency of ancient Greek Literature and art, and the influence they have exercised on the whole course of European thought. These are themes, which have indeed been often dealt with more or less profoundly, but are as yet very far from being exhausted. They open a field of inquiry of great and varied beauty, many parts of which are yet to be explored.

The first lecture contains a statement of the argument in defence of classical, particularly of Grecian learning. After some very just remarks on the mutual dependence of science and letters, the author proceeds to shew that classical studies are important, because the language of science is borrowed from Greece and Rome, and because a knowledge of the classical languages opens a way to rich sources of information in regard to the arts understood by the ancients. In the next place the Greeks were acute observers when they devoted themselves to Natural Science, and excelled in the collection and arrangement of facts. In these respects, Aristotle still ranks with the ablest philosophers in the world. A language, therefore, which contains such invaluable treasures as the writings of that great man on Natural History, can hardly receive too much attention even from men of science.

As literature deals more particularly with the taste and sensibilities of man, the effects of literary pursuits, being more strictly confined to the mind, are less obvious, and their claims less likely to be appreciated. But in proportion as the intellectual nature and moral sensibilities of man are more important than mere scientific attainments, in the same proportion those studies, connected with this nature and these sensibilities, ought to be held in higher estimation. Mr. Moore answers the objection to the study of the ancient languages, drawn from the great amount of time necessary to be spent in their acquisition, by shewing, that the study of language is particularly suited to the unfolding of the mental powers. From this part of the discussion we extract the following remarks.

“ When the education of a youth is, according to the common

estimate, complete, how little, how very little does he know, in comparison with what may yet be learned! The whole amount of his knowledge is as nothing, in comparison with the extent to which he still continues ignorant. The chief value of his education, therefore, must consist in the cultivation it bestows upon his mind. The worth of youthful studies must be rated, less by the importance of the subjects on which they are employed, than by their adaptation to their great end; which is, to strengthen the intellectual powers; and train up the mind to activity and vigor, by sound discipline, and well ordered exercise. Hence the propriety of conducting through the same preparatory course of study those intended for different pursuits in life. And hence, too, may be derived a sufficient answer to an objection often urged; that the studies in question have no relation to the intended callings of many who pursue them. For, however paradoxical the assertion may appear, yet experience will approve it to be true, that a youth, who has pursued with diligence the study of the ancient languages, though he shall, upon going forth into the world, and engaging in the active duties of life, throw aside his books, never to open them again, is so far from having *wasted* the hours spent upon them, that he could not have employed the same portion of time with equal advantage in any other way. But if the mere study of a language be in this point of view important, the actual possession of it will appear no less so, when we consider, how much an acquaintance with *one*, facilitates the acquisition of a *second*, and a *third*; what essential aid a knowledge of the *ancient* affords to the student of *modern* tongues, as respects the utility of which there is no dispute; and that it is difficult, if indeed it be possible to know well even our own language, otherwise than through the medium of the Latin and Greek. But, not to dwell on these, and other like arguments; is it not enough, that Greek lays open to us, and renders accessible, the richest treasures of human wisdom; the fairest creations of the mind of man? Can we need a more persuasive motive to the study of a language than that it contains the most perfect models of poetry, of history, of eloquence? That it is the language in which Homer sang; in which Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon record events they were actors in, or describe scenes they saw? In which Demosthenes roused or allayed at will the passions of his hearers? Can we be indifferent, lastly, to that language, in which are contained the sacred scriptures of the New Testament, and the most ancient and venerable version of the Old? pp. 17 — 19.

The following passage contains some observations, which strike us as particularly seasonable and just.

“That in a country like our own, where few men are without some calling or employment in life, from which they derive subsistence ; and to engage in the active duties of which, they are hurried away from their youthful studies, with an impatience natural enough, perhaps, in a society circumstanced as ours is ; that in such a country, the complaints elsewhere made, of the devotion to classical learning of so great a portion of the time of youth, have been renewed in even a louder tone, and have found more attentive listeners, ought not, perhaps, to excite surprise. These complaints, though founded in error, appeal to the prejudices of an age possessed with such a love of innovation, that it looks with an evil eye at systems of instruction established on the sure basis of long experience, *merely* because they are *ancient* ; of an age so devoted to the pursuit of gain, that it regards with little favor what has not a tendency to promote some pecuniary end ; as though there were nothing suited to advance the condition of society, or to grace and embellish life, except improvements in railways ; the devising new applications of steam ; the opening new channels of trade ; or the discovery of some new process in the arts. These complaints, I say, have their foundation in error, for they suppose, that one employed in the study of classical literature is employed upon empty sounds ; is acquiring nothing that can aid him in the serious pursuits of life. But this is far from being true. And if it were so, we might still with truth maintain, that the object of youthful studies is not so much to *furnish*, as to *form* the mind. Classical studies, however, while they, in the most effectual manner, attain this chief end of youthful discipline, do much besides. They not only *form* the faculties, but supply the *memory* with a rich stock of information. The student spends much time in learning words, no doubt ; but he cannot learn the signs, without at the same time gaining some acquaintance with the things signified. Does he not learn the history, geography, and chronology of the ancient world ; the civil, military and religious institutions ; the private life, manners, and customs of the most interesting nations of the earth ; as also, the wisest systems of philosophy and morals, that unassisted human reason has been able to invent ? Does he not become acquainted with the most sublime and beautiful monuments of human wit and genius ? And is it possible that all this should be unattended with most sensible advantage ? What does experience teach us on this head ? Let us use that of England ; the country with which, next to our own, we are most familiar. Shakspeare alone excepted, (who, it has been well remarked, is an exception to all rules,) what great poet, historian, orator, statesman, lawyer, or divine, has she produced, who was not a classical scholar ? Hear the testimony which Chatham, one of the great-

est of her statesmen and orators ; one of those few who may be compared with the best of Greece or Rome ; bears to the value of the studies we are called upon to defend. Writing to his young nephew, he expresses his joy to hear that he has begun Homer's *Iliad*, and has made great progress in Virgil, and his hope that he tastes and loves particularly authors, who are not only the two greatest poets, but who contain the finest lessons for his age to imbibe ; lessons of honor, courage, disinterestedness, love of truth, command of temper, gentleness of behavior, humanity, and in one word, virtue in its true signification. He exhorts his nephew to drink deep of those divine springs ; and assures him that the pleasure of the draught equals the prodigious advantage of it to the heart and morals. Milton teaches, both by precept and example, the great value of these studies, and prays God to recompense a father, whose 'exceeding great care had caused him to be diligently instructed in the tongues.' Locke states with his own entire approbation the opinion of La Bruyère, that languages are the proper study of our early years ; that they are useful to men of all conditions, and open an entrance, to the most profound, as well as to the more entertaining parts of learning." pp. 19—23.

The concluding observations of this lecture are expressed with much elegance and force. But the remark that the finest productions of genius in the arts, strike with less admiration at first than afterwards, must be received with some qualification. There are some works, which, from their curiously elaborated structure and learned details, cannot be wholly understood at first. These must grow in our esteem, in proportion as they become familiar. A *Paradise Lost*, and a *Mécanique Celeste*, must await the verdict of patient meditation. But the Homeric rhapsodies doubtless gave as much delight when chanted to the assembled multitudes at the Panathenæa, as they now give the scholar "in the still air of delightful studies." A tragedy of *Æschylus* or *Sophocles* was as truly understood and as highly appreciated by the thirty thousand critics who thronged the theatre of Bacchus, as by the learned commentators, who pour out their ponderous opinions "in notes of many a winding bout," of the most unreadable Latinity. The *Apollo Belvidere* was doubtless welcomed with as deep an enthusiasm, when the glory of his form first burst from the marble, as that now felt or pretended by the multitudes who crowd to his presence in the Vatican.

After all, the main argument for classical studies, is neither

the necessity of knowing Greek and Latin, to a thorough knowledge of English, nor the adaptation of the study of language to the powers of childhood and youth. The strongest argument lies in two considerations; the excellence of the classical authors, taken independently of every thing else, and the fact of their antiquity. As works of taste and genius they stand, if not at the head, at least in the foremost ranks of literature. The authors which we have, are the choice authors, the picked men of all antiquity; and within their narrow circle we have the best representatives of every species of literary work. When letters awoke from the sleep of the dark ages, the classics became the teachers of taste and elegance to the reviving intellect of Europe. They were made the basis of a learned education, and intermingled with the delightful associations of the dewy morning of life. Much of the charm and splendor of Modern Literature is imparted to it by the veins of golden thought which run through every part of its structure, from the inexhaustible mines of Antiquity. The voice of British Eloquence was trained in the schools of Athens and Rome; and the stately song of Greece sustained the majestic march of Milton.

But there is much, as we have said, in the fact of their antiquity to claim our respect. One of the most foolish whims of this age is to deride a love of the old. Those who are absurd enough to do so, forget, or perhaps never knew, that there lies deep in the human heart, an inextinguishable reverence for the past. As time goes on, all the meannesses that encompass human life disappear, and the grand features in the characters of the Ages alone remain as objects of our contemplation. The venerable forms of antiquity stand before us in severe relief, and we bow down in a willing homage of the heart to their unutterable majesty. The love of the old is connected with the best and highest feelings of our nature. The past is sacred. It is set beyond the revolutions of nature and the shifting institutions of man. So much of beauty, of experience, of wisdom is secure from the touch of change. He who would destroy this treasury of the heart and mind, by rudely assailing our reverence for the old, would rob human life of half its charm and nearly all its refinement. Let no enthusiastic student then, permit his ardor to be chilled by the fear that his love has been wasted on an unreal thing; that he has been bewildered by an idle dream; and that he has lost so



much precious time, which ought to have been given to the stirring interests of the present ; for he may rest assured that the study of antiquity has a noble power to elevate his mind above the low passions of the present, by fixing its contemplations on the great and immortal spirits of the past.

In the second lecture, Mr. Moore gives a general view of Greek Literature, from the earliest ages down to the period of its decline and fall. A subject of such immense variety and extent, can be handled within such narrow limits, only in the most summary manner. The prominent points may be touched upon, and an outline drawn, but the filling up and the coloring must be omitted. Such a view is useful to collect the facts and opinions, gathered from a long course of study, into some appearance of system and order. Mr. Moore succeeds uncommonly well in distributing the parts of his subject, and compresses into a small compass a great deal of information. He divides the subject matter of this lecture according to the following events or dates ; — the capture of Troy ; the Age of Homer ; the Legislation of Solon ; the Conclusion of the Persian War ; the accession of Alexander to the throne of Macedonia ; the capture of Corinth and establishment of the Roman power and influence in Greece ; and the Removal of the Seat of Empire to Byzantium. With these dates as points of division, he proceeds to consider Greek Literature by the epochs called the Fabulous, the Poetical, the Athenian, the Alexandrian, and the Byzantian ages.

Of the Fabulous age, we have only a few mighty names. Olen, Thamyris, Orpheus, and Musaeus gained a celebrity far back in antiquity, which has preserved their memories much longer than their works. Mr. Moore examines the so called remains of Orpheus, in this part of the discussion, and after stating the opinions of distinguished scholars on the question of their genuineness, seems, if we understand him, to incline towards a belief that they may, after all, be the productions of the poet, whose name they bear. From this view we entirely dissent, and hold, with the generality of critics, that they are impudent forgeries of a later age.

In sketching the history of the Poetic Age, our author passes over the poems of Homer for the present, and occupies himself with those of less note, stating what is known of Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Archilochus, and the “Sententious Poets,” and concluding with some excellent remarks on the union of Poetry and Music in that age.

We quote the following rapid view of Athenian Literature.

“We shall find a suitable occasion hereafter to consider this interesting portion of our subject; and must for the present content ourselves with a mere passing notice. It might at first view seem possible to examine this so brief period in at least the cursory, and superficial manner hitherto adopted; but, to be convinced of the contrary, we need only call to mind the names of those, who by the splendor of their genius now illumined the walks of history, the drama, philosophy, eloquence and art; shedding over the whole of this period such a blaze of intellectual light, that, not confined to Athens, nor that age, it has beamed through all succeeding times, and still fixes our admiring gaze. Into the causes of this phenomenon we will inquire hereafter; that it is one which may well excite our wonder, will be evident if we consider, that beside the many others whose works are wholly lost to us, there flourished during this brief period of one hundred and fifty years, such dramatists as Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes; the historians Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon; the father of medicine, Hippocrates, the Great, the Divine, as he was styled; in oratory, Lysias, Isocrates, Isæus, Æschines, Demosthenes; in philosophy, Plato and Aristotle, not to mention Socrates, the great teacher and master of them all; nor the many others, who, though distinguished for the arts of war or peace, do not now properly come under our consideration; as Themistocles, Aristides and Cimon; Pericles, Alcibiades and Phocion; Phidias, Myro and Praxiteles; Panæus, Apollodorus, Polygnotus, Parrhasius, Zeuxis and Apelles. By all these and many more besides, was this period illustrated, and they were all, with two or three exceptions, either native citizens of Athens, or dwelt and flourished there.” pp. 49—50.

In some respects, the Alexandrian age is a particularly interesting epoch in the history of Greek Literature. There was unquestionably much talent, various learning, and even some fine poetry, at the splendid court of the Ptolemies. Theocritus carried pastoral poetry to its highest point of perfection. He described the manners of rural life with inimitable graphic power; and in one of his admirable dialogues gives a lively representation of the tittle-tattle of half a dozen women, at a public festival held by the queen of Egypt. But in general, there was a great lack of correct taste, and a still greater lack of original genius. The conceits of the Italian *Trecentisti* give but a faint idea of the puerilities, — the axes, altars, birds, and eggs, — that sprang up in full vigor, to the disgrace of letters,

during the Alexandrian Age. The old spirit of Greek life, the animating sentiment of liberty had departed, and the freshness of Grecian genius, its free and living flow, its bright, sparkling, ever-working soul, had departed with it. The dews of morning, the full rich light of noon-day, had passed by the shadows of evening had set in, and the fantastic forms of night had begun to come forth. Yet, though the sun of Grecian genius had gone down, a bright procession of stars, Apollonius, Theocritus, Moschus, Bion, Callimachus, and the "Tragic Pleiades," shone with a mild lustre in the sky.

The Roman age dates from the capture of Corinth, by Mummius, the Roman Consul. After this event, the arts and letters of Greece were spread by slow degrees over the Roman empire. Public libraries were formed in Rome and elsewhere, and a love of elegant literature, softened the harsh and warlike spirit of the masters of the world. The subjects most copiously treated by the Greek writers of this age, were those connected with history, and political philosophy; and the productions of these authors, though deficient in taste and purity of style, may safely be reckoned among the most important remains of antiquity. Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus — the geographers, Strabo and Pausanias — with many other writers of less note, have a high and indestructible value. We are inclined to think, if this portion of ancient literature were to be as carefully studied as the elegant authors of the best days of Athens, and the Latin writers in the time of Augustus, it would be found even more rich in the teachings of human experience, and the materials of political philosophy.

The following remarks on the Byzantine age conclude the second lecture.

"The last division of our subject, the *Byzantine* age, extends from A. D. 328 to 1453 of our era, a period of one thousand one hundred and twenty-five years. Though this long night of ages produced a multitude of authors whose works still remain, they are not such, as on the present occasion should engage our notice. The most important amongst them are the Byzantine writers Procopius, Agathias, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Anna Comnena, Cinnamus and others; whose works, contained in thirty-six folios, constituted the principal source from which Gibbon drew the materials for his history. These times possessed, too, poets, such as Quintus of Smyrna, and Nonnus; grammarians

and philologists, as Hesychius, Suidas, Gregory of Corinth, and Eustathius; ingenious romancers, some of whom, as Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Xenophon of Ephesus, are distinguished even for the beauty of their style. One of the greatest men, and perhaps the most voluminous writer of this period, was St. John Chrysostom, the Demosthenes of the Greek church, as he has been styled by some, though critics think he should be compared rather with the Roman orator. Of him, and other fathers of the church, who lived in this age, as of those also, who with the inspired writers of the New Testament, belong to the Roman age, and of the translation of the Seventy in the age preceding, I have declined all other mention, because of the extent and nature of the subject; which is not one to be dealt with in that hasty and superficial manner I of necessity adopt.

“It may perhaps excite surprise, that those who treat this subject should descend in their consideration of it to so low a period; and speak of Grecian literature as that of a living tongue, so late even as the middle of the fifteenth century. But it is notwithstanding true, that the subjects of the Byzantine throne were, even to this time, and in their lowest servitude and depression, possessed, as the historian of this period observes, of a golden key that could unlock the treasures of antiquity. Philelphus, giving a picture of the state of society in Constantinople, where he lived but thirty years before its fall, a picture somewhat highly colored we may suppose, by his Italian imagination, says, that those who had preserved their language free from the corruption of the vulgar tongue, spoke in ordinary discourse, even at that day, as the comic Aristophanes, the tragic Euripides, the orators, philosophers and historians of classic Greece; that all persons about the Imperial Court, and especially the noble matrons, had retained the dignity and elegance of the ancient tongue.” pp. 67 — 69.

The history of the Greek language is one of the most interesting subjects of literary investigation. Men of the clearest judgment unite with enthusiastic scholars in declaring it to be unrivalled for richness, copiousness and strength. The old Ionic form, with its sounding combinations of vowels, gives a beautiful and liquid flow, while its happy descriptive and imitative epithets impart the liveliness of painting itself, to the stately hexameter. The Doric is sweet and simple in pastoral poetry, but rises to a severe grandeur in the lyrics of Pindar, and the choral songs of the Tragedians. The Attic is the language of dramatic dialogue, history, logic and philosophy; the language of the high-wrought, impassioned argument of Demosthenes, the smooth eloquence of Isocrates, the refined subtlety of Ly-

sias; the language of the wire-drawn reasonings of Socrates, and the stern truths of Thucydides. Now, whence came this curiously contrived instrument of human thought? What strange coincidence of happy influences wrought out of the simple elements of sound, its extraordinary variety of expressive powers? What finely organized people first gave utterance to its immortal harmonies? From what region, blest with Heaven's selectest influence, came they to the shores of Greece? These are questions which have exercised the wits of the acutest men, and the learning of the ablest scholars, but with no very satisfactory result.

Mr. Moore marks out three periods in the history of the language. The first comprehends the seven or eight centuries before the Trojan war. The second extends from this war to the reign of Alexander the great, and the third from Alexander to the present time.

During the first period, the Ionic and Doric Dialects received their highest cultivation; and became respectively the languages of Epic and Lyric poetry. In the second period, Ionic prose composition, and Attic prose and verse, were carried to their highest point of perfection. Within this period the drama, history, philosophy and eloquence poured their concentrated light on the city of Athens.

In the third period, the language began to decline in purity, with the decline of correct taste and simplicity of thought. The Alexandrian and Roman ages afforded, it is true, some specimens of chaste writing; but the downward progress of the language, was unceasing and increasing.

After some remarks on the obscurity that hangs over the origin of the Greek language, Professor Moore states an opinion, which like an hypothesis in natural science, reconciles all the known facts with each other. The language of the old Pelasgians was either the Sanscrit, or some dialect closely allied to the Sanscrit. The Greek is this Pelasgian dialect modified by time and the exigencies of society. The Pelasgians came from central Asia, spread over the North of Europe as well as Greece, and left traces of their language wherever they happened to settle. This hypothesis accounts for the affinities pointed out by Dr. Jamieson between the Greek and Gothic, and for the similarity discovered by Bopp, between the conjugations of the Sanscrit, and those of the Greek, Latin, Persic and German. Mr. Moore lays out of the question the notion

of Valekenaer, that the Greek was deliberately constructed on a system of philosophical principles, independently of all other languages; and he considers the hypothesis which derives the Greek wholly or chiefly from the Hebrew, altogether inadmissible, inasmuch as the two languages have no radical affinity with each other. He coincides with the opinion of Ihre, a learned Swede, that the Scythian or Gothic, the Greek and the Latin, have a common origin; that the Scythian or Gothic is the oldest of the three; that Greece was originally inhabited by Scythians, and that to them many Greek words are to be traced. This opinion is confirmed by the result of Sir William Jones's inquiries, namely, that the earliest Persians, the Indians, the Goths, Greeks and Romans, together with the old Egyptians or Ethiops, spoke originally one language; and that the Jews, Arabs and Abyssinians spoke another, a primitive dialect, wholly different. From which it follows, if this opinion be correct, that the Sanscrit, the old language of the Indians, and the Greek, were, at some remote period, the same.

The following historical facts are given by Mr. Moore, in further illustration of this subject.

“We learn from Thucydides and others that the first inhabitants of Greece led a wandering life, without any fixed abode; and from this their mode of life it is supposed their name, *πελασγοί*, (Pelasgians,) was derived. But this same people, who from their way of life were styled Pelasgians, were also called *Ἴωνες*, or *Ἰάονες*, Ionians or Javans; a name, the origin of which, those who bore it were themselves unable to ascertain. Some, with Herodotus, thought it derived from Ion, son of Xuthus; an opinion which Bochart and other learned writers have clearly shown to be unfounded. Others merely say it descended to them ‘from their ancestor, or from a king who once reigned over them.’ Thus, Greeks unacquainted with the sacred scriptures; but Josephus, when speaking of the settlements made by the several sons of Japheth, says, ‘from Javan, Ionia and all the Greeks derive their origin;’ and this Bochart declares to be the sentiment ‘of the ancients and the moderns all.’ The sure ground, upon which this generally received opinion rests is the Bible; which teaches us, far more correctly than the Greeks themselves could do, who this ancestor of the Ionians was. In the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis we find Javan mentioned among the sons of Japheth, by whom ‘the isles of the Gentiles were divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families in their nations;’ and since in several passages of scripture, Greece is in the original called Javan; an appellation which some modern translations have

retained; the inference, considering the practice of the sacred writers, is unavoidable; that this country was originally settled by that son of Japheth from whom it derived its name."—pp. 83, 84.

Mr. Moore next discusses that remarkable phenomenon in the Greek language, the existence of several dialects, equally the instruments of literary composition, each appropriated to one particular kind. The modern languages, as he observes, are spoken in a similar variety of local dialects, but choice or accident has fixed upon some one, and made it exclusively the language of elegant literature. Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio spoke and wrote the Tuscan, and their works being the first productions of high poetic talent, in any form of the Italian, stamped the Tuscan forever, as the polite language of Italy. Calderon, Lopez de Vega and others, exercised the same influence in setting the Castilian over all the other dialects of Spain. The reformers of the sixteenth century made the dialect of Misnia, the literary language of Germany. In English, the dialect of Allan Ramsay's Gentle Shepherd, and of many of the sweetest songs of Burns, corresponds in no slight degree with the Grecian Doric. Mr. Moore assigns the existence of these several dialects, to three principal causes; first, the mutual rivalry of the different states; secondly, the dependence of the richer and more cultivated classes on the lower orders, which made them more ready to adopt their forms of speech; and, lastly, "the existence in their dialects, while they were as yet altogether, or chiefly oral, of the finest productions of poetic genius, caused to be retained afterwards in a written shape, distinctions that were inherent in the form and structure of the verse." We conclude this part of the subject with the following extract.

"We shall view this subject in its true light if we consider, that one and the same primitive tongue came to be spoken in different parts of Greece and her colonies, and by different tribes, with a great variety of modifications, which are commonly classed under one or other of four dialects; the *Æolic*, the *Doric*, the *Ionic* and the *Attic*; and these are again, with great propriety, reduced to two; the *Doric* and the *Ionic*, this two-fold division of the dialects of Greece corresponding with that of its inhabitants into those of *Dorian*, and those of *Ionian* race; by whom, respectively, these dialects were used. The *Ionian* colonists of *Asia Minor* were the first to soften the asperities of the ancient ruder tongue, and to give it consistency and polish. Their example was afterwards followed by *Attica*, their mother country. The *Dorian* colonists in *Italy*

and Sicily seem to have been the first to cultivate their dialect to any great extent. The Æolian, departing least of all from the primitive form, continued to retain most traces of the rudeness and harshness of the ancient tongue; yet this was the language in which Sappho, Erinne, and Corinna sang. Anacreon struck his lyre to the softer sounds of the Ionian; esteemed most musical of all the four.

“As out of one common language these four dialects by degrees arose; so each particular dialect in process of time underwent considerable change. It is obvious, however, that this must have been gradual; and that it cannot be easy to determine with accuracy the limits between old, and new; or old, middle, and new, for so they are distinguished. Every living language must be in a state of change; and though its motion be slow and imperceptible, yet, being constant, it produces in time very sensible effects.

“As each of these dialects changed, from time to time, its general character; so did it also, at any given time, vary from place to place. And these varieties were called local dialects. The Grecian writers, however, seldom used with all its local peculiarities, the language of the particular place or people to which they happened to belong; but adopted, in greater or in less degree, the dialect of which their vernacular tongue was a local subdivision. Thus Pindar did not write the language spoken at his native Thebes; nor Theocritus that used at Syracuse; but they adopted, though in different degrees, the general Doric dialect of the period at which, respectively, they lived and wrote.

“It is further to be observed, that writers living at the same time, in the same place, and making use of the same dialect, modified it variously, and adopted more or less of its peculiarities, according as the nature of the subject required them to descend to or rise above the familiar phraseology of ordinary life. The dialect, moreover, in which an author wrote was not always that of his country, or that he was accustomed to employ in speech; but his choice was regulated by the nature of his subject, the place at which he chanced to be, or the persons whom he wished to gratify. Thus the same writer, perhaps, would use the Ionic-poetic dialect, as that of Homer has been called, if he wrote heroic verse; the Doric, in a pastoral poem; and Attic, if he attempted tragedy. The dialect of Pindar was not that of his fair countrywomen Myrtis and Corinna. Simonides of Ceos, who on other occasions used Ionic, when at the court of Hiero, and writing for Doric patrons, adopts their dialect. Callimachus, too, when he writes at Argos, makes use of the dialect prevailing there; as in his hymn on the Bath of Minerva, and in that addressed to Ceres. Herodotus and Hippo-



crates, though both Dorians, adopt in their writings the Ionic dialect, because in that the earliest prose compositions were contained.

“The choral parts of Grecian tragedy adopt in some particulars the Doric dialect; a fact for which, as yet, no reason altogether satisfactory has been assigned. But there have been different conjectures; as that, these Doricisms are traces of the original rusticity of the chorus; that they add to the language a certain dignity; that, the most eminent lyric poets having used the Doric dialect, it had in consequence, become more appropriate to the lyric parts of tragedy. Since almost the only Doricisms are occasional substitutions of the letter  $\alpha$  for the long vowels  $\eta$  and  $\omega$ ; and since the music of the choral parts was, as shall be shown hereafter, of a more impassioned character than that by which the dialogue was accompanied, and appears to have differed from it somewhat as the airs and choruses of the Italian serious opera do from the recitative; one motive for the adoption of the Doric dialect, in the limited extent just mentioned, may have been that the letter  $\alpha$  was especially suited to the musical divisions of the chorus; as the same vowel sound has by modern musicians been preferred to any other, for that same purpose of running their divisions. An ancient Greek writer upon music, Aristides Quintilianus, observes, that of the doubtful vowels,  $\alpha$  is best adapted to melody; being, because of the broadness of its sound, most easily prolonged; and that of the consonants, which, to avoid hiatus, must of necessity be united with the vowel sounds, the best is  $\tau$ . We find him, therefore, pointing out as best suited to musical modulations the very syllable  $\tau\alpha$ , which is still a favorite with musical composers.

“But to return from this digression. It was observed that a writer of heroic verse among the Greeks would adopt the dialect of Homer. It will be proper to extend somewhat our remarks upon this head. This dialect or language of Homer, which has been called Hellenic, was no one of the dialects we have been considering; but the common source of all. It was the language of the country and the age in which he lived; and, because of his great excellence, it continued to be that of poetry, especially of epic and heroic poetry, through all succeeding times. But though the language of Homer continued to be the language of that kind of poetry to which it had been consecrated by his use, it gradually ceased to be the tongue of any one people. Some terms and forms of words were retained in the dialect of one place or people; others in that of another. Some forms and modes of expression became obsolete, except in so far as they were retained in use by poets, in imitation of their great exemplar. These were called poetic licenses; and characterized the poetic dialect. Of the ancient Homeric language each dialect preserved some part, that

in the kindred dialects fell into disuse; and in after times grammarians spoke of such Homeric forms, as being according to this or that dialect in which they were so preserved. And when it has happened that a particular word survived only in some single tribe, or state, we hear of the Bœotian dialect, the Cyprian, Pamphylian, Sicilian, Chalcidian, Cretan, Tarentine, Lacedæmonian, Argive, Thessalian, and others. Hence we may discover the reason why

“Smyrna, Rhodes, Colophon, Salamis, Chios, Argos, Athenæ”

could all lay claim to the honor of having given birth to Homer. He used a language which had once been common to them all; but afterwards the language spoken at Rhodes and Argos was called Doric; at Colophon and Chios the dialect used was Ionic; and at Salamis and Athens, Attic; distinctions in the tongue of these several cities that grew up amongst them after Homer’s age.

“Viewing the matter in this light, we shall easily account for the difference of opinion between those who maintain that Homer was an Ionian; and call his dialect, Ionic-poetic; and those again, who think he was an Æolian, and that the basis of his language is Æolic. It will be evident that Homer, as respects his dialect, was neither Æolian nor Ionian; but used a language, which contained the germs of all those peculiar dialects that afterwards arose.

“Until after the conclusion of the Persian war, or during the first of the periods before mentioned, the dialects chiefly cultivated were the Ionic, the Æolic, and the Doric; and in the first of these dialects, towards the close of this period, Grecian prose was first written; either by Anaximander, or by Cadmus of Miletus, or by a disciple of the former, Pherecydes of Syros, who, though commonly regarded as the earliest prose writer among the Greeks, died less than forty years before the battle of Salamis.

“During the second of our periods, or from the Persian war until the death of Alexander, the genius of Athens shone forth with such brightness as to throw into shade the literature of every other part of Greece; and the drama, history, philosophy, and eloquence, having been all brought to perfection in the polished dialect of Athens, it has to them, consequently, ever since remained appropriate; and upon the wide diffusion of the Greek language through the extensive regions over which Alexander’s successors reigned, the Attic dialect, in consequence of the superiority of Attic literature, became the basis of the general language of composition; though certain kinds of poetry still continued to retain the dialect that had ever been appropriated to them. Athens, it is true, lost together with her political independence her literary pre-eminence; but her language still maintained its

empire, even at the court of the Ptolemies; where Grecian arts and letters again revived, after their almost extinction during the wars that succeeded the dismemberment of the Macedonian empire." — pp. 87 — 94.

The remainder of this lecture is occupied with some particulars concerning the Romaic or Modern Greek; a dialect that, from its intimate relations with the ancient, and from its lately acquired importance, as being spoken by the people of an independent kingdom, bids fair to become one of the most interesting languages of Europe. The principal changes it has undergone from the ancient forms are the following. It has adopted the use of auxiliaries to nearly as great an extent as the languages of Latin parentage. The terminations of cases are fewer; prepositions are constructed with different cases, and in different senses, from the ancient; modern particles are parts of old Greek words, as *δὲν* from *οὐδὲν*, *νὰ* from *ἰνὰ*; ancient Greek words are changed by adding Turkish terminations; derivative or secondary, or accidental meanings of old words, are made the ground-meanings of the new. Mr. Moore gives several striking examples of this change. Besides this, a large body of words, borrowed from Italy and Turkey, have been incorporated into the Romaic, and many terms, expressive of ideas and combinations unknown to the ancients, have been added by the obvious necessity of the case. But yet, the language is radically and substantially the same as the ancient, to a surprising degree, when we consider the political changes which that unhappy people have been subjected to during so many centuries. It can be accounted for only by the fact, that a portion of the Grecian people guarded themselves with jealous care from the polluting contact of their barbarian oppressors, and preserved the fire of the Greek character unextinguished amidst the storms that swept with desolating fury over their devoted land.

The modern Greek is daily drawing nearer to the form and character of its venerable parent. Educated writers take great care to lop off the barbarous additions of the Turks, and are gradually bringing back the variety of ancient declension. They borrow largely from the Hellenic, not only words in their old meanings, but the elements to compound new words. This process will undoubtedly go on until the language has assumed a permanent form, and adapted itself to all the exigen-

cies of polished literature. The rhythmical beauty of the ancient is unquestionably lost. The united flexibility, complexity and simplicity, which gave it its unexampled harmony, can never be restored. Ancient versification can never lend its variety and majesty to the Romaic. We must be content to leave the union of accent and quantity, to which the Attic ear was so exquisitely sensible, among the lost secrets of antiquity. But the Romaic is equal to the French in logical clearness of construction, and almost to the Italian, in the music of its sound. If it has lost the charm of quantity, it has gained the attraction of rhyme. If it has lost something of the stateliness of antiquity, it has gained the simplicity and copiousness, which belong to modern times.

Mr. Moore is hardly correct in saying that the modern Greeks have no literature. The Greek language has been used by innumerable writers, both of prose and poetry, at every period of its history since the capture of Corinth. Within the last fifty years authors of no mean merit have sprung up in almost every department of letters ; logic, philosophy, theology, have not been unattempted by them. Dramatic and lyric poetry have been cultivated, the former with moderate, the latter with remarkable success. The *Aspasia* of Ritzos has been republished in America. The language of this work is polished and pure. The verse is modelled after the French *Alexandrian*, and like the French, it has even the modern ornament of rhyme. In imitation of the ancients, the author has introduced the chorus. In the conception and delineation of character, it must be confessed that Ritzos never rises above mediocrity ; that in essential dramatic talent, in creative poetic genius, he is utterly deficient ; and that the *Aspasia* with all its rhymes and choral songs is rather hard reading.

But there is a large class of poems, peculiarly modern, and essentially popular ; — the *Kleptic* songs. These have grown out of the singular condition of the mountain tribes, who maintained themselves in a wild independence, beyond the reach of Turkish despotism. They are mostly short, commemorating some striking event or wild exploit, and are full of picturesque beauty, breathing a fiery genius worthy of the best days of the Grecian lyre. Of late years they have excited a lively interest among men of letters in Europe.

The lively genius of the Greek has given birth to a great variety of other popular songs. The elegant *Anacreontics* of

Christopulus, will always be admired for graceful expression, lively imagery, and a delightful gaiety of sentiment. But besides the beautiful productions of their original genius, the modern Greeks have been busily employed in translating a large number of the best works in European literature. Dr. Coray has but lately ended a long and active life, devoted to the literature and the liberty of his country. No man has done so much to raise the standard of style, to free the language from barbarism, to spread the love of sound learning among his countrymen, as this admirable scholar. He edited in Paris a select library of the ancient classics, chosen according to their supposed applicability to the existing condition of the nation, and prefixed to them introductions in modern Greek, which are models of chaste composition and stirring eloquence. It is true that the modern Greeks have not yet had a Dante, a Shakspeare or a Milton; but they have done enough to show that they have a prodigious strength of national character; that they cherish an enthusiastic pride of country and ancestry; and that they have the genius to restore the long lost glories of their intellectual dominion. They read and study the works of their great ancestors, in the spirit and with the pride of fellow countrymen. Their education is founded on their ancient literature; and with what advantages for the full comprehension of its sublimest beauties! the soil beneath them, the hills around them, hallowed by the thronging associations of history, moistened by the blood of the defenders of freedom, and now redeemed from the pollution of barbarian footsteps. The institutions of modern civilization are rapidly forming. With a young prince on the throne of Greece brought up at a court distinguished for literary and classical taste, under the care of a father whose ruling passion is the study of ancient learning and art, and educated in an enthusiastic love of Grecian letters, by one of the most illustrious scholars of Germany; the Greeks may reasonably expect a system of government in genial union with the spirit of their nation, and anticipate a speedy revival of poetry and art, in something approaching their ancient splendor. The enlightened councils of Bavaria, supported by the unanimous approbation of Europe, can hardly fail of rapidly removing every obstacle to the complete regeneration of Greece.

The next two lectures contain a discussion of the "Analogy of the Greek language," or the principles of derivation, inflex-

ion, and classification according to termination, which prevail throughout its whole structure. In treating this subject, Mr. Moore avails himself of the works of three distinguished scholars ; Valckenaer, Von Lennep, and Cattier. The theories of these profound philologists are stated in a very clear and succinct form. We must content ourselves with recommending these two valuable lectures to the particular attention of young students, without further comment.

The sixth and concluding lecture is wholly taken up with the subject of Greek pronunciation. The discussion contains, first, a brief statement of the Reuchlinian and Erasmian systems ; then a more particular examination of the Reuchlinian system, and the arguments which lead the author to give it a decided preference. Connected with the foregoing, Mr. Moore handles the subject of Greek accents, treating of their history, import, and use. We acknowledge the ability, learning and candor which the Professor shows in the management of all these topics, but we are obliged to dissent wholly from his opinion of the superiority of the Erasmian over the Reuchlinian pronunciation. The question is attended with many difficulties, and perhaps can never be settled to the satisfaction of all. Without going into the endless field of argument and conjecture, we will attempt to illustrate our view of the merits of the question by a hypothetical example. Suppose the English nation were to be overrun in the course of ages by hordes of barbarous invaders. Suppose their literature to degenerate, and their language to become corrupt. A portion of the people, however, remain unsubdued, and the language continues, under certain modifications, to be written and spoken in the country ; so that, in its worst state, it bears so strong a resemblance to the old form, that a good English scholar may learn it in a month. Who, in the case just imagined, would have the best right to settle the pronunciation of old English, the descendants of the ancient English people, or the French, Germans, and Italians ? Which would be the best method of approximating to the pronunciation of antiquity, to take the fact of the existing pronunciation, as a basis, or to assume a probability, and by reasoning on abstract principles, infer what it was from what we imagine it ought to have been ? What sort of work would a Frenchman make of English, or an Englishman make of French, were he to proceed in the spirit of such a preposterous method ? Now the Greeks of this age are descended

from the Greeks of the age of Demosthenes. There never has been an interregnum in their language; there never has been a time when any other language has taken the place of their own. Corrupted as their language is, the substance of it is Greek. Bad as their pronunciation may be, ours must be worse. If they have departed from the pronunciation of their ancestors, Erasmus and his followers must have departed from it still more. The one has at least the authority of tradition, the other has little more than the authority of conjecture. We confess we are inclined to let the Greeks teach us how to pronounce the language of their country and ancestry. We find it hard not to sympathize with the ludicrous perplexity with which an accomplished Greek gentleman listens to the sounding hexameters of Homer, as they are read to him by an English or American scholar. We have before remarked that, in our opinion, the power of uniting accent and quantity, precisely as the ancients did, is now lost. But we have no doubt that if Demosthenes could rise up to day, and go to a council of state in Athens, he would comprehend with tolerable ease the drift of the arguments there used, provided King Otho's councillors should not take it upon them to discuss the affairs of Greece in High Dutch. But if the awful Shade were to enter a classroom in one of our universities, and hear a Freshman glibly construing his own magnificent oration on the crown, would he not stare with amazement, when told that the young gentleman was reciting the very eloquence he had himself, at the height of his powers and renown, "fulminated over Greece?" Would he be likely to cry out, with the jealous dramatist of Queen's Anne's age, "*that's my thunder?*"

The subject has been ably treated, as the literary world well know, by the Honorable John Pickering, in a paper printed in the transactions of the American Academy. The argument in that paper, has always seemed to us scarcely less than conclusive. But the whole matter is likely to undergo a fresh discussion, as soon as the present Greek nation shall have come into close political and literary relations with the rest of Europe.

The new interest, which the study of classical antiquity will acquire from connecting it with a living, commercial, and literary language, will lead, as we think, to a departure from the present conjectural method of pronunciation. The present language of Greece will have to be studied as an important

subsidiary aid to the full understanding of the ancient ; and our scholars will find it hard, if not impossible, to pronounce the one like a living language, without extending that pronunciation to the other.

We look for much instruction from the native scholars of Greece. We doubt not the beauties of classic literature will be more learnedly and fully displayed than they have ever yet been. There must be in the scenery of the country, in the modes of thought, expressions, customs, traditions of the people, an immense amount of interesting and important illustration. And as to verbal criticism, and conjectural emendation of corrupted passages, who would not prefer the native tact and the sure feeling of a born Greek, to the learned guesses of the ablest commentator in any German University ?

---

ART. V. — *Biographies of Wayne and Vane.*

*The Library of American Biography.* Conducted by  
JARED SPARKS. Vol. IV.

THE preceding volumes of this miscellany have been noticed in our journal. We learn with satisfaction, that it will be continued. The volumes, which have hitherto appeared, present an interesting and instructive variety of historical and biographical research. A work conducted on the plan of the library of American biography occupies an important middle ground, between a biographical dictionary and a history. It affords a convenient vehicle for information relative to distinguished individuals and memorable occurrences, which might run into too great length, for the opposite purposes either of a biographical dictionary or a general history. The experience of all ages has pronounced in favor of works of this description. Plutarch's parallel lives may be considered as their representative specimen, and perhaps for all classes of readers, Plutarch's lives is as great a favorite as any work ever composed, the bible excepted.

The present volume of the biographical library contains less variety than some of its predecessors, but it is equally valuable. A memoir of Anthony Wayne occupies the first portion of it, but the greater part of the volume is devoted to a life of